

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1480 (WWW.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/872,311	05/31/2001	David Kar Ling Lo	13004US01	4548
7:	590 10/09/2003		EXAMINER	
Robert W. Fieseler			TALBOT, BRIAN K	
	eld & Malloy, Ltd. son Street. 34th Floor		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chicago, IL 6	50661		1762	
			DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003	}

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/872,311	LO ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brian K Talbot	1762				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 28 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THatte on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. sion and the corresponding amount of the distautory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriat e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>						
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);					
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does N	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: none.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11 and 13-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exar	miner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				

Brian K Talbot Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1762

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Finally rejected claims did not require a loading composition substantially free of electrocatalyst.